

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected.

Claims 22 and 38 have been canceled.

Claims 1-21 and 23-37 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Support for these amendments can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0019], [0020], and [0034] of the originally-filed Application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,804,657 (“Sultan”) alone or in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,516,084 (“Sankaran”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 16, and 32 have been amended to include new limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that these new limitations are not found within either Sultan or Sankaran, either considered individually, or considered in combination.

Independent Claims 1, 16, and 32 now recite limitations to: (1) automatically generate a plurality of forecast snapshots from a forecast definition; (2) store each of the generated forecast snapshots at intervals of time over a period of time; and (3) generate forecast information using the plurality of forecast snapshots.

The newly added limitations provide for an efficient method of presenting forecasting information because the forecasting information can be derived from previously generated and stored forecast snapshots. The alternative to the claimed method would be to generate all the forecasting information at the time the forecasting information is requested. However, because the claimed method performs the forecast snapshot generation beforehand and stores the results, the request for forecasting information can be satisfied more quickly than if the time-intensive generation of forecasting information were performed at the time the request is made.

Applicants respectfully submit than neither Sultan nor Sankaran teach or suggest these newly added limitations, at the very least because neither reference contemplates improving the efficiency of generating forecast information by using, in any fashion, previously stored and generated forecast snapshots.

Sultan discloses generating the sales forecast described therein by aggregating forecast sales information. *See* Sultan 2:30-38. However, Sultan's method is directed at sales forecasts from various remote sites of a multi-national corporation. *See* Sultan 2:8-30. In other words, Sultan's sales forecasts, at some point, must be manually entered into a computer for them to be accessible. Clearly, the steps of Sultan's process are markedly different from those of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is directed to generating, at a regular interval over a period of time, a plurality of forecast snapshots based on a forecast definition. One benefit of the claimed method is that it allows for displaying forecast information that includes a summary derived from the stored plurality of forecast snapshots. No such features are shown, taught, suggested, or even derivable from the cited sections of Sultan, or from the remainder of Sultan. One reason for Sultan's lack of such features is Sultan's failure to contemplate storing forecast snapshots at intervals of time. It follows that Sultan also fails to contemplate the more specific feature of storing forecast snapshots at intervals of time over a period defined by a forecast definition. In fact, a keyword search of the entire Sultan reference reveals that the word "interval" does not appear once, nor do any comparable concepts. Failing to show, teach or suggest any such actions or their performance at a given interval, it is impossible for Sultan to teach or suggest the newly added limitations, among others, by definition.

Sankaran is directed to the management of forecast data. *See* Sankaran Abstract. However, Sankaran does not show, teach or suggest any way to generate such forecast data, nor does Sankaran contemplate any particular method of doing so. Further, Sankaran does not contemplate storing forecast snapshots at intervals of time, nor of doing so over a period of time defined by a forecast definition. As with Sultan, Sankaran does not once mention the term "interval," nor concepts comparable with the claimed forecast interval. Thus, for reasons similar to those discussed in connection with Sultan,

PATENT

Sankaran cannot be said to teach or contemplate the newly added limitations, and so, by definition, is incapable of curing these deficiencies in Sultan.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither Sultan nor Sankaran, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent Claims 1, 16, and 32, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, the Application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099